

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE  
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

IMATION CORPORATION )  
v. Plaintiff, ) Civil Action No. \_\_\_\_\_  
LEEF USA, LLC )  
Defendant. )  
JURY TRIAL REQUESTED

## COMPLAINT

Plaintiff Imation Corporation (“Imation”), for its Complaint for patent infringement against Leef USA, LLC (“Leef”), alleges as follows.

## THE PARTIES

1. Imation is a corporation organized under the laws of the state of Minnesota, with its principal place of business at 1 Imation Way, Oakdale, MN 55126.
  2. On information and belief, Leef is a limited liability corporation organized under the laws of the State of Utah with its principal place of business located at 625 S. State Street, Unit C, Salt Lake City, Utah 84111.

## **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

3. This is a civil action for patent infringement arising under the patent laws of the United States, Title 35 of the United States Code Section 1 *et. seq.*

4. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).

5. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Leef because Leef conducts substantial and continuous business in this judicial district. Leef sells its products in retail locations throughout Minnesota. Leef also offers products for sale in Minnesota through the internet that Imation alleges infringe Imation's patents. This Court has specific jurisdiction over Leef because it has committed acts giving rise to this action and has established minimum contacts within this judicial district such that the exercise of jurisdiction over Leef would not offend traditional notions of fair play and justice.

6. Venue is proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b) and 1400(b) because Leef conducts business in this District and the acts giving rise to the claims asserted therein occurred in this District.

## **IMATION AND THE PATENTS-IN-SUIT**

7. Imation was founded in 1996. Since Imation began, Imation's business has centered around technological innovation. Imation develops new technology and patents it. Imation has been developing technology related to USB flash drives since at least as early as the early 2000s.

8. On June 21, 2005, the United States Patent and Trademark Office (the "PTO") issued Patent No. 6,908,038 (the "038 Patent"), entitled, "Multi-Connector

Memory Card with Retractable Sheath to Protect the Connectors,” to Trung V. Le. A true and correct copy of the ‘038 Patent is attached hereto as **Exhibit A**.

9. On January 27, 2009, the PTO issued Patent No. 7,481,659 (the “‘659 Patent”), entitled, “Multiconnector Memory Card,” to Gregory H. Johnson and Daniel C. Egan. A true and correct copy of the ‘659 Patent is attached hereto as **Exhibit B**.

10. On May 19, 2009, the PTO issued Patent No. 7,535,718 (the “‘718 Patent”), entitled, “Memory Card Compatible with Multiple Connector Standards,” to Trung V. Le. A true and correct copy of the ‘718 Patent is attached hereto as **Exhibit C**.

11. Imation is the owner by assignment of all rights, title and interest to and in the ‘038 Patent, the ‘659 Patent and the ‘718 Patent.

**COUNT I**  
**(Infringement of the ‘038 Patent)**

12. Imation realleges and incorporates herein the allegations set forth in Paragraphs 1-11.

13. Leef has directly infringed at least claim 11 of the ‘038 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(a), literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, by making, using, selling, and/or offering for sale in the United States and without authority products that infringe such claims, including the Bridge 3.0 Mobile USB drive and the Bridge 2.0 Mobile USB drive (together, the “Infringing Products”).

14. Leef has also and continues to indirectly infringe at least claim 11 of the ‘038 patent by inducing others to infringe and/or contributing to the infringement of others, including third party users of the Infringing Products in this judicial district and

elsewhere in the United States. Specifically, Imation alleges that Leef has actively induced and continues to induce the infringement of at least claim 11 of the ‘038 patent by actively inducing the use of the Infringing Products by third party users in the United States. Imation alleges that when Leef offered for sale or sold the Infringing Products, Leef knew or should have known that its conduct would induce others to infringe claim 11 of the ‘038 patent by using it. Imation alleges that third parties have infringed and will continue to infringe the ‘038 patent in violation of 35 U.S.C. 271(a) by using the Infringing Products.

15. Leef has also contributorily infringed at least claim 11 of the ‘038 patent by providing to third parties within the United States infringing devices that are not staple articles of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing uses. Imation believes that these third parties have infringed and will infringe the ‘038 patent in violation of 35 U.S.C. 271(a).

16. Imation has suffered damages as a result of Leef’s infringement of the ‘038 Patent. In addition, Imation will continue to suffer irreparable harm unless this Court enjoins Leef from infringing the ‘038 Patent.

**COUNT II**  
**(Infringement of the ‘659 Patent)**

17. Imation realleges and incorporates herein the allegations set forth in Paragraphs 1-16.

18. Leef has infringed at least claim 1 of the ‘659 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(a), literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, by making, using, selling, and/or

offering for sale in the United States and without authority products that infringe such claims, including the Infringing Products.

19. Leef has also and continues to indirectly infringe at least claim 1 of the ‘659 patent by inducing others to infringe and/or contributing to the infringement of others, including third party users of the Infringing Products in this judicial district and elsewhere in the United States. Specifically, Imation alleges that Leef has actively induced and continues to induce the infringement of at least claim 1 of the ‘659 patent by actively inducing the use of the Infringing Products by third party users in the United States. Imation alleges that when Leef offered for sale or sold the Infringing Products, Leef knew or should have known that its conduct would induce others to infringe claim 1 of the ‘659 patent by using it. Imation alleges that third parties have infringed and will continue to infringe the ‘659 patent in violation of 35 U.S.C. 271(a) by using the Infringing Products.

20. Leef has also contributorily infringed at least claim 1 of the ‘659 patent by providing to third parties within the United States infringing devices that are not staple articles of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing uses. Imation believes that these third parties have infringed and will infringe the ‘659 patent in violation of 35 U.S.C. 271(a).

21. Imation has suffered damages as a result of Leef’s infringement of the ‘659 Patent. In addition, Imation will continue to suffer irreparable harm unless this Court enjoins Leef from infringing the ‘659 Patent.

**COUNT III**  
**(Infringement of the '718 Patent)**

22. Imation realleges and incorporates herein the allegations set forth in Paragraphs 1-21.

23. Leef has infringed at least claim 1 of the '718 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(a), literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, by making, using, selling, and/or offering for sale in the United States and without authority products that infringe such claims, including the Infringing Products.

24. Leef has also and continues to indirectly infringe at least claim 1 of the '718 patent by inducing others to infringe and/or contributing to the infringement of others, including third party users of the Infringing Products in this judicial district and elsewhere in the United States. Specifically, Imation alleges that Leef has actively induced and continues to induce the infringement of at least claim 1 of the '718 patent by actively inducing the use of the Infringing Products by third party users in the United States. Imation alleges that when Leef offered for sale or sold the Infringing Products, Leef knew or should have known that its conduct would induce others to infringe claim 1 of the '718 patent by using it. Imation alleges that third parties have infringed and will continue to infringe the '718 patent in violation of 35 U.S.C. 271(a) by using the the Infringing Products.

25. Leef has also contributorily infringed at least claim 1 of the '718 patent by providing to third parties within the United States infringing devices that are not staple articles of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing uses. Imation believes that

these third parties have infringed and will infringe the ‘718 patent in violation of 35 U.S.C. 271(a).

26. Imation has suffered damages as a result of Leef’s infringement of the ‘718 Patent. In addition, Imation will continue to suffer irreparable harm unless this Court enjoins Leef from infringing the ‘718 Patent.

#### **PRAAYER FOR RELIEF**

For the above reasons, Imation respectfully requests that this Court grant the following relief in its favor and against Leef:

- (a) A judgment in favor of Imation that Leef has infringed (either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents) one or more claims of the ‘038 Patent, the ‘659 Patent and the ‘718 Patent;
- (b) A permanent injunction enjoining Leef and its officers, directors, agents, servants, affiliates, employees, divisions, branches, subsidiaries, parents, and all others acting in active concert or participation with it, from infringing the ‘038 Patent, the ‘659 Patent and the ‘718 Patent;
- (c) A judgment and order requiring Leef to pay to Imation its damages, costs, expenses, and pre-judgment and post-judgment interest for Leef’s infringement of the ‘038 Patent, the ‘659 Patent and the ‘718 Patent; and
- (d) Any and all such further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

Pursuant to Rule 38(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Imation demands a trial by jury of this action.

Dated: March 7, 2014

WINTHROP & WEINSTINE, P.A.

By s/Michelle E. Dawson

Devan V. Padmanabhan #0240126

Michelle E. Dawson #0388610

WINTHROP & WEINSTINE

225 South Sixth Street, Suite 3500

Minneapolis, MN 55402

Telephone: (612) 604-6400

Facsimile: (612) 604-6800

[dpadmanabhan@winthrop.com](mailto:dpadmanabhan@winthrop.com)

[mdawson@winthrop.com](mailto:mdawson@winthrop.com)

Attorneys for Plaintiff Imation Corporation

8849999v1