

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

| | | |
|------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| ALEX IS THE BEST, LLC, |) | |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff, |) | |
| |) | |
| v. |) | C.A. No. _____ |
| |) | |
| ASUS COMPUTER INTERNATIONAL, |) | TRIAL BY JURY DEMANDED |
| |) | |
| Defendant. |) | |
| |) | |

COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT

Plaintiff Alex is the Best, LLC. (“AITB”), by and through its undersigned counsel, brings this action against Asus Computer International (“Asus” or “Defendant”). In support of this Complaint, AITB alleges as follows:

NATURE OF THE SUIT

1. This is an action for patent infringement for patent infringement under the Patent Laws of the United States of America, 35 U.S.C. § *et seq.*, including 35 USC 271.

THE PARTIES

2. Plaintiff AITB is a limited liability company organized under the laws of the state of New York with its principal place of business at 75 82nd St., Brooklyn, New York 11209.

3. On information and belief, Asus is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the state of California, with its principal place of business at 800 Corporate Way, Fremont, California 94539. Defendant can be served with process through its agent National Corporate Research, Ltd., at 10 East 40th Street, 10th Floor, New York, New York 10016.

4. Defendant is in the business of making, using, selling, offering for sale and/or importing network-enabled image capturing devices.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

5. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28U.S.C. §§1331 and 1338(a) because the action arises under the patent laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. §§1 et seq.

6. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant by virtue of its systematic and continuous contacts with this jurisdiction, as well as because of the injury to AITB and the cause of action AITB has raised, as alleged herein.

7. Defendant is subject to this Court's specific and general personal jurisdiction pursuant to due process and/or the Delaware Long-Arm Statute, due to at least its substantial business in this forum, including: (i) at least a portion of the infringement alleged herein; and (ii) regularly doing or soliciting business, engaging in other persistent courses of conduct, and/or deriving substantial revenue from goods and services provided to individuals in this District.

8. Defendant has conducted and does conduct business within this District, directly or through intermediaries, resellers, agents, or offer for sale, sell, and/or advertise (including the use of interactive web pages with promotional material) products in this District that infringe the Asserted Patents.

9. In addition to Defendant's continuously and systematically conducting business in this District, the causes of action against Defendant is connected (but not limited) to Defendant's purposeful acts committed in this District, including Defendant's making, using, importing, offering for sale, or selling products which include features that fall within the scope of at least one claim of the Asserted Patents.

10. Venue lies in this District under 28 U.S.C. §§1391 and 1400(b) because, among other reasons, Defendant is subject to personal jurisdiction in this District, and has committed and continues to commit acts of patent infringement in this District. For example, Defendant has used, sold, offered for sale, and/or imported infringing products in this District.

THE PATENTS-IN-SUIT

11. There are two patents at issue in this action: United States Patent Nos. 8,134,600 (the “’600 Patent”); and 8,477,197 (the “’197 Patent”) (collectively, the “Asserted Patents”).

The ’600 Patent

12. On March 13, 2012 the USPTO duly and legally issued the ’600 Patent, entitled “Internet Direct Device” after a full and fair examination to inventors Frank Clemente and Ted Feaser. AITB is presently the owner by assignment of the ’600 Patent, having received all rights, title, and interest in and to the ’600 Patent. AITB possesses all rights of recovery under the ’600 Patent, including the exclusive right to recover for past infringement. A true and correct copy of the ’600 Patent is attached to this Complaint as Exhibit A.

The ’197 Patent

13. On July 2, 2013 the USPTO duly and legally issued the ’197 patent, entitled “Internet Direct Device” after a full and fair examination to inventors Frank Clemente and Ted Feaser. AITB is presently the owner by assignment of the ’197 Patent, having received all rights, title, and interest in and to the ’197 Patent. AITB possesses all rights of recovery under the ’197 Patent, including the exclusive right to recover for past infringement. A true and correct copy of the ’197 Patent is attached to this Complaint as Exhibit B.

DESCRIPTION OF THE ACCUSED PRODUCTS

14. Defendant's network-enabled image-capturing devices (hereinafter, "Image-capturing Devices"), including but not limited to the Asus Nexus 7 (2013), are configured to take still and video images. Defendant's Image-capturing Devices are configured to transmit and receive still and video images to and from other Image-capturing Devices, as well as a website application, on which still and video images captured by the Image-capturing Devices can be stored and managed.

15. For example, one such website application that allows users to store and manage still and video images captured by Image-capturing Devices is Google+.

16. The Asus Nexus 7 (2013) is an Internet direct device as it allows the user to access the Internet through a variety of connections, including but not limited to Wi-Fi and various cellular networks such as 3G and 4G LTE. Thus, the Asus Nexus 7 (2013) is an Internet direct device with an imaging system to capture still or video images.

COUNT I (INFRINGEMENT OF THE '600 PATENT)

17. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1-16.

18. In violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271, Asus is now, and has been directly infringing and/or inducing infringement of the '600 Patent.

19. Defendant has had knowledge of infringement of the '600 Patent at least as of the service of the present complaint.

20. Asus has directly infringed and continues to directly infringe at least claim 1 of the '600 Patent by making, using, importing, offering for sale, and/or selling Image-capturing Devices without authority in the United States, and will continue to do so unless enjoined by this

Court. As a direct and proximate result of Asus's direct infringement of the '600 Patent, Plaintiff has been and continues to be damaged.

21. Asus has indirectly infringed and continues to indirectly infringe at least claim 1 of the '600 Patent by actively inducing their respective customers, users, and/or licensees to directly infringe by using, selling, offering to sell and/or Image-capturing Devices. Asus engaged or will have engaged in such inducement having knowledge of the '600 Patent. Furthermore, Asus knew or should have known that its action would induce direct infringement by others and intended that its actions would induce direct infringement by others. For example, Asus sells, offers for sale and advertises Image-capturing Devices in Delaware specifically intending that its customers buy and use said products. As a direct and proximate result of Asus's indirect infringement by inducement of the '600 Patent, Plaintiff has been and continues to be damaged.

22. To the extent that facts learned in discovery show that Defendant's infringement of the '600 Patent is or has been willful, AITB reserves the right to request such a finding at the time of trial.

23. As a result of Defendant's infringement of the '600 Patent, AITB has suffered monetary damages and is entitled to a monetary judgment in an amount adequate to compensate for Defendant's past infringement, together with interests and costs.

24. AITB will continue to suffer damages in the future unless Defendant's infringing activities are enjoined by this Court. As such, AITB is entitled to compensation for any continuing or future infringement up until the date that Defendant is finally and permanently enjoined from further infringement.

(COUNT II)
INFRINGEMENT OF THE '197 PATENT

25. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1-24.

26. In violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271, Asus is now, and has been directly infringing and/or inducing infringement of the '197 Patent.

27. Defendant has had knowledge of infringement of the '197 Patent at least as of the service of the present complaint.

28. Asus has directly infringed and continues to directly infringe at least claim 1 of the '197 Patent by making, using, importing, offering for sale, and/or selling Image-capturing Devices without authority in the United States, and will continue to do so unless enjoined by this Court. As a direct and proximate result of Asus's direct infringement of the '197 Patent, Plaintiff has been and continues to be damaged.

29. Asus has indirectly infringed and continues to indirectly infringe at least claim 1 of the '197 Patent by actively inducing their respective customers, users, and/or licensees to directly infringe by using, selling, offering to sell and/or importing Image-capturing Devices. Asus engaged or will have engaged in such inducement having knowledge of the '197 Patent. Furthermore, Asus knew or should have known that its action would induce direct infringement by others and intended that its actions would induce direct infringement by others. For example, Asus sells, offers for sale and advertises integrated Image-capturing Devices in Delaware specifically intending that its customers buy and use said products. As a direct and proximate result of Asus's indirect infringement by inducement of the '197 Patent, Plaintiff has been and continues to be damaged.

30. To the extent that facts learned in discovery show that Defendant's infringement of the '197 Patent is or has been willful, AITB reserves the right to request such a finding at the time of trial.

31. As a result of Defendant's infringement of the '197 Patent, AITB has suffered monetary damages and is entitled to a monetary judgment in an amount adequate to compensate for Defendant's past infringement, together with interests and costs.

32. AITB will continue to suffer damages in the future unless Defendant's infringing activities are enjoined by this Court. As such, AITB is entitled to compensation for any continuing or future infringement up until the date that Defendant is finally and permanently enjoined from further infringement.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

33. AITB demands a trial by jury as to all issues that are triable by a jury in this action.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, AITB prays for the following relief:

A. That Defendant be adjudged to have infringed the Asserted Patents, directly and/or indirectly, by way of inducement and/or contributory infringement, literally and/or under the doctrine of equivalents;

B. That Defendant, its officers, directors, agents, servants, employees, attorneys, affiliates, divisions, branches, parents, and those persons in active concert or participation with any of them, be permanently enjoined from infringing the Asserted Patents;

C. An award of damages pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §284 sufficient to compensate AITB for the Defendant's past infringement and any continuing or future infringement up until the date

that Defendant is finally and permanently enjoined from further infringement, including compensatory damages;

D. An assessment of pre-judgment and post-judgment interest and costs against Defendant, together with an award of such interest and costs, in accordance with 35 U.S.C. §284;

E. That Defendant be directed to pay enhanced damages, including AITB's attorneys' fees incurred in connection with this lawsuit pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §285; and

F. That AITB have such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

October 18, 2013

BAYARD, P.A.

/s/ Richard D. Kirk

Richard D. Kirk (rk0922)

Stephen B. Braerman (sb4952)

Vanessa R. Tiradentes (vt5398)

Sara E. Bussiere (sb5725)

222 Delaware Avenue, Suite 900

P.O. Box 25130

Wilmington, DE 19899

rkirk@bayardlaw.com

sbraerman@bayardlaw.com

vtiradentes@bayardlaw.com

sbussiere@bayardlaw.com

(302) 655-5000

Attorneys for Plaintiff Alex is the Best, LLC