

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
MARSHALL DIVISION**

SCRIPT SECURITY SOLUTIONS L.L.C.,

Plaintiff,

v.

PANASONIC CORPORATION OF  
NORTH AMERICA,

Defendant.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:15-cv-1032

COMPLAINT FOR PATENT  
INFRINGEMENT

**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

**COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT**

Plaintiff Script Security Solutions, L.L.C. (“Script”) files this complaint against the above-named defendant, alleging, based on its own knowledge as to itself and its own actions and based on information and belief as to all other matters, as follows:

**PARTIES**

1. Script is a limited liability company formed under the laws of the State of Texas, with a principal place of business in Austin, Texas.

2. Defendant Panasonic Corporation of North America (“Panasonic”) is a corporation organized under the laws of Delaware with a principal place of business in Secaucus, NJ. Panasonic Corporation of North America can be served through its resident agent for service of process in Texas: C T Corporation System, 1999 Bryan Street, Suite 900; Dallas, TX 75201 USA.

**JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

3. This is an action for infringement of a United States patent arising under 35 U.S.C. §§ 271, 281, and 284–85, among others. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction of the action under 28 U.S.C. §1331 and §1338(a).

4. Venue is proper in this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391 and 1400(b). Upon information and belief, Panasonic has transacted business in this district and has committed, by itself or in concert with others, acts of patent infringement in this district.

5. Panasonic is subject to this Court’s specific and general personal jurisdiction pursuant to due process and/or the Texas Long Arm Statute, due at least to Panasonic’s substantial business in this forum, including: (i) at least a portion of the infringements alleged herein; and/or (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 Texas and in this district.

**COUNT I**

**DIRECT INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,542,078**

6. On April 1, 2003, United States Patent No. 6,542,078 (“the 078 patent”) was duly and legally issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office for an invention entitled “Portable Motion Detector and Alarm System and Method.”

7. Script is the owner of the 078 patent with all substantive rights in and to that patent, including the sole and exclusive right to prosecute this action and enforce the 078 patent against infringers, and to collect damages for all relevant times.

8. Panasonic made, had made, used, imported, provided, supplied, distributed, sold, and/or offered for sale products and/or systems including its Home Monitoring Systems (the

“accused products”). By doing so, Panasonic has directly infringed (literally and/or under the doctrine of equivalents) the 078 patent. Panasonic’s infringement in this regard is ongoing.

9. Script has been damaged as a result of the infringing conduct by Panasonic alleged above. Thus, Panasonic is liable to Script in an amount that adequately compensates it for such infringements, which, by law, cannot be less than a reasonable royalty, together with interest and costs as fixed by this Court under 35 U.S.C. § 284.

10. Script and/or its predecessors-in-interest have satisfied all statutory obligations required to collect pre-filing damages for the full period allowed by law for infringement of the 078 patent.

## **COUNT II**

### **DIRECT INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,828,909**

11. On December 7, 2004, United States Patent No. 6,828,909 (“the 909 patent”) was duly and legally issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office for an invention entitled “Portable Motion Detector and Alarm System and Method.”

12. Script is the owner of the 909 patent with all substantive rights in and to that patent, including the sole and exclusive right to prosecute this action and enforce the 909 patent against infringers, and to collect damages for all relevant times.

13. Panasonic made, had made, used, imported, provided, supplied, distributed, sold, and/or offered for sale products and/or systems including its Home Monitoring Systems (the “accused products”). By doing so, Panasonic has directly infringed (literally and/or under the doctrine of equivalents) the 909 patent. Panasonic’s infringement in this regard is ongoing.

14. Script has been damaged as a result of the infringing conduct by Panasonic alleged above. Thus, Panasonic is liable to Script in an amount that adequately compensates it

for such infringements, which, by law, cannot be less than a reasonable royalty, together with interest and costs as fixed by this Court under 35 U.S.C. § 284.

15. Script and/or its predecessors-in-interest have satisfied all statutory obligations required to collect pre-filing damages for the full period allowed by law for infringement of the 909 patent.

**ADDITIONAL ALLEGATIONS REGARDING INDIRECT INFRINGEMENT**

16. Panasonic has also indirectly infringed the 078 and 091 patents by inducing others to directly infringe the 078 and 091 patents. Panasonic has induced the end-users to directly infringe (literally and/or under the doctrine of equivalents) the 078 and 091 patents by using the accused products. Panasonic took active steps, directly and/or through contractual relationships with others, with the specific intent to cause them to use the accused products in a manner that infringes the 078 and 091 patents. Such steps by Panasonic included, among other things, advising or directing customers and end-users to use the accused products in an infringing manner; advertising and promoting the use of the accused products in an infringing manner; and/or distributing instructions that guide users to use the accused products in an infringing manner. Additionally, Panasonic provides services that notify users remotely when an alarm that detects motion (including motion of a window or door) is triggered. This induces end-users to use the accused products in a manner that infringes the 078 and 091 patents. Panasonic's inducement is ongoing.

17. Panasonic has also indirectly infringed by contributing to the infringement of the 078 and 091 patents. Panasonic has contributed to the direct infringement of the 078 and 091 patents by the end-user of the accused products. The accused products have special features that are specially designed to be used in an infringing way and that have no substantial uses other

than ones that infringe the 078 and 091 patents. The special features include the ability of users to remotely receive notifications when an alarm that detects motion (including motion of a window or door) is triggered in a manner that infringes the 078 and 091 patents. The special features constitute a material part of the invention of one or more of the claims of the 078 and 091 patents and are not staple articles of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing use. Panasonic's contributory infringement is ongoing.

18. Panasonic knew of the 078 and 091 patents before the filing of this action.

19. Panasonic has had knowledge of the 078 and 091 patents since at least 2009 because the 078 and 091 patents were widely cited by Panasonic's competitors and other industry leaders in their own patent applications from the issuance date on.

20. Panasonic also has knowledge of the 078 and 091 patents at least as of the date when it was notified of the filing of this action.

21. Furthermore, Panasonic has a policy or practice of not reviewing the patents of others (including instructing its employees to not review the patents of others), and thus has been willfully blind of Script's patent rights.

22. Panasonic's actions are at least objectively reckless as to the risk of infringing a valid patent and this objective risk was either known or should have been known by Panasonic.

23. Panasonic's direct and indirect infringement of the 078 and 091 patents is, has been, and continues to be willful, intentional, deliberate, and/or in conscious disregard of Script's rights under the patent.

24. Script has been damaged as a result of the infringing conduct by Panasonic alleged above. Thus, Panasonic is liable to Script in an amount that adequately compensates it

for such infringements, which, by law, cannot be less than a reasonable royalty, together with interest and costs as fixed by this Court under 35 U.S.C. § 284.

25. Script and/or its predecessors-in-interest have satisfied all statutory obligations required to collect pre-filing damages for the full period allowed by law.

**JURY DEMAND**

Script hereby requests a trial by jury on all issues so triable by right.

**PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

Script requests that the Court find in its favor and against Panasonic, and that the Court grant Script the following relief:

- a. Judgment that one or more claims of the 078 and 091 patents have been infringed, either literally and/or under the doctrine of equivalents, by Panasonic and/or all others acting in concert therewith;
- b. A permanent injunction enjoining Panasonic and its officers, directors, agents, servants, affiliates, employees, divisions, branches, subsidiaries, parents, and all others acting in concert therewith from infringement of the 078 and 091 patents;
- c. Judgment that Panasonic accounts for and pays to Script all damages to and costs incurred by Script because of Panasonic's infringing activities and other conduct complained of herein;
- d. That Script be granted pre-judgment and post-judgment interest on the damages caused by Panasonic's infringing activities and other conduct complained of herein;
- e. That this Court declare this an exceptional case and award Script its reasonable attorney's fees and costs in accordance with 35 U.S.C. § 285; and
- f. That Script be granted such other and further relief as the Court may deem just

and proper under the circumstances.

Dated: June 12, 2015

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Califf T. Cooper

Matthew J. Antonelli

Texas Bar No. 24068432

matt@ahtlawfirm.com

Zachariah S. Harrington

Texas Bar No. 24057886

zac@ahtlawfirm.com

Larry D. Thompson, Jr.

Texas Bar No. 24051428

larry@ahtlawfirm.com

Califf T. Cooper

Texas Bar No. 24055345

califf@ahtlawfirm.com

ANTONELLI, HARRINGTON & THOMPSON  
LLP

4306 Yoakum Blvd., Ste. 450

Houston, TX 77006

(713) 581-3000

*Attorneys for Script Security Solutions L.L.C.*